

U.S. film periodicals

by John Hess and Chuck Kleinhans

from *Jump Cut*, no. 38, June 1993, pp. 105-122

copyright *Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media*, 1993, 2006

Media Salad: With this issue we are starting Media Salad as a regular JUMP CUT feature. This section will cover resource pieces and overviews, such as the following article on U.S. film periodicals, as well as shorter reviews of books, videos, festivals, and other materials. As editors we're aware that we often learn about items such as occasional publications that would be of interest to many readers but which may not be known to them. We also see this section as a place for discussion of pragmatic and institutional issues in media analysis, such as copyright, teaching, and publication. Given the rapidly changing media scene, with new and changing technologies, Media Salad will occupy a space between a notes column and an extended review section. Publications, tapes, and other items for consideration should be sent to Chuck Kleinhans at Radio/Television/Film Department, Northwestern University, 1905 Sheridan Road, Evanston IL 60208.

The following article surveys the state of film criticism as represented by film periodicals in three parts. In the first we give a very brief overview of the history and place of film magazines in the United States and then discuss the current film culture situation. In the second part we discuss individually a selected number of the more important, representative, and/or popular film publications. In the final part we give basic information about these magazines and few others that are mentioned in the first part but which we do not discuss in detail in the second part. We have arranged the last two parts in alphabetical order. This overview can only be a snapshot of a changing scene. It was originally written for a special of *CineAction* (France) on film periodicals around the world, and it was based on research done in 1990-91. We invite additions and corrections and will add updates in future issues of JUMP CUT. We also plan updates on film periodicals in English from other countries and publications on cultural studies.

INTRODUCTION

The vast majority of film magazines published in the United States today are less than 20 years old. While a lively discussion of film took place before WW2, none of the critical magazines — often associated with the left in the 1930s — survived the

War. A very few early magazines — all of them attached to the film industry in Hollywood — continue to publish today. The technical magazines, *SMPTE Journal* (Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, 1916) and *American Cinematographer* (1919), along with the business magazines, *Variety* (1905), *Box Office* (1920), *Hollywood Reporter* (1930), and *Film Journal* (1934) continue today.

While almost from its origins cinema has attracted the critical attention of intellectuals in the United States, critical writing on film for a long time tended to be occasional, often either the review or the article dealing with a topical issue, such as a case of censorship. This allowed individuals to develop a perspective, but either their writing was scattered over various publications or put into the regularity of a review column. Places for the sustained discussion of film as an art and social phenomenon which brought together diverse and specialist voices existed only sporadically before World War 2. The film magazine forms an essential institution for the critical analysis of cinema and the existence of a film culture that allows and encourages its development.

A new intellectual, cultural, and social discussion of cinema begins with the founding in 1945 of the *Hollywood Quarterly*, associated with the prestigious University of California at Los Angeles, one of the first schools to have a department of film, and the founding two years later of the University Film Association's journal. This latter organization was and remains a professional association primarily of film production teachers in universities. The most important film journalistic event in the 1950s and the real beginning of an intellectual film culture in the United States was the founding in 1955 of *Film Culture* by Jonas Mekas, recently arrived from his native Europe. It was the first postwar magazine to aggressively promote cinema as an art form and to become a transmission belt for European ideas about the cinema into the United States. This lively magazine originally validated cinema classics of the past, European art films, and important work in U.S. commercial cinema. After a few years, however, it became the house organ for the New American Cinema, originally a mix of the U.S. version of cinema verité and the burgeoning avant-garde or underground cinema. Maya Deren and Hans Richter wrote about their own work, Parker Tyler praised Cassavetes' *SHADOWS* and Richard Leacock explained his notion of an "Uncontrolled Cinema." *Film Culture*'s place in the United States greatly resembles that of the 1950s *Cahiers du cinéma* in France. In fact, Andrew Sarris' early articles popularizing the "Auteur Theory" appeared in *Film Culture*. In the later 1960s and on into the 70s when it ceased publication, *Film Culture* became almost exclusively preoccupied with avant-garde experimentation.

The foundation of three new magazines in the 1960s continued this process of absorbing ideas on the cinema from Europe. *The Society for Cinematologists Journal* (1961, now called *Cinema Journal*), *Film Comment* (1962), *Cineaste* (1967), along with *Film Culture* each came out of very different milieux and developed quite separate sets of ideas which continue to mark serious writing about film in the United States. In fact, we could probably quite easily place most

subsequent film critical magazines into the traditions founded by *Film Culture* (avant-garde, independent filmmaking), *The Society for Cinematologists Journal* (academic), *Film Comment* (conventional aesthetic approach to commercial film, after an earlier stage similar to *Film Culture*), and *Cineaste* (social, political approach). The fact that such a loose categorization so easily suggests itself points to the narrowness and specialization of U.S. magazines in general and the kinds of artificial divisions which exist in funding, making, screening, teaching, and discussing cinema.

The 1970s saw a virtual explosion of new magazines about film and associated forms of mechanical and electronic reproduction of images (video, TV, photography, advertising, etc.), an expansion that has not abated — media magazines continue to arise like mushrooms after a heavy rain. And these magazines are increasingly specialized. Some of these magazines, of course, fall by the wayside — most unfortunately in the early 1970s the groundbreaking feminist publication *Women and Film* (1970-75).

While some charge that serious film criticism in the United States has become academicized and then dismiss it as an ivory tower pursuit (a frequent theme in *Cineaste*, for example), this simplification actually obscures the larger situation. We need to understand that for a significant number of intellectuals in the post-WW2 era, film became a significant area of concern. Andrew Sarris and Pauline Kael quarreled in print, but both thought the movies an important concern of "public intellectuals" (those members of the intelligentsia who take up the task of affecting public opinion, taste, and social and political policy). Susan Sontag's famous essay on the "two cultures" (high culture and mass culture) was a high point in the early 60's marking (as did Pop Art as a movement) the ability of a new generation of intellectuals to embrace both high art and popular art at the same time, as opposed to an earlier generation's denunciation of commercial art (as in Dwight MacDonald's critique of "middlebrow" culture, and Clement Greenburg's essay "Avant-Garde and Kitsch"). For the generation of the 60s film was an important art form, one which gave them British realism, Bergman, the French New Wave, Fellini, Antonioni, Visconti, as well as access to Buñuel and the classics of the past. It also gave them, through the U.S. version of authorship and genre analysis, ways of understanding and appreciating the Hollywood films they grew up on and the new films and filmmakers which fascinated them, from BONNIE AND CLYDE to EASY RIDER, Peckinpah to Woody Allen.

This provided an abundant harvest to feed hungry growing minds and spirits, and it shaped a generation, the Baby Boomers, born in expanding affluence and raised with tv sets. Film could speak directly to the vital interests of young adults: love, ethics, politics, moral choice, how to live one's life. That many of those people who loved the movies passionately, and who cut their teeth on them, then went on to write about them and use criticism as a tool for their own understanding and development is hardly surprising, though it marks the first time in the United States that large numbers of people passionately became involved in the ongoing discussion of an aspect of mass culture (popular and folk forms had been discussed earlier, especially with folk music and jazz, but not always in the most commercial

aspects). This was the (middle class, college-educated) demographic and social base for an expanding film culture. Such an environment, set in the period of the Vietnam War, the Black Power movement, the birth of a new feminist movement, and other signs of social and political upheaval sparked the optimism that fueled establishing new publications explicitly setting forth an agenda for criticism.

The Cold War and McCarthyism had silenced many intellectuals in the postwar era. Suddenly a new generation openly took up the idea of cultural and intellectual work that was not divorced from politics and social change. *Cineaste* championed Third World Film and militant documentary, *Women & Film* began the feminist critique of media also then taken up by *Camera Obscura*, *Jump Cut* presented an openly marxist and feminist stance. As specialized publications, these magazines went beyond the *belles lettres* writing common to left-liberal criticism typified at that time by say, Stanley Kauffman, reviewer for *The New Republic*. They expected an audience knowledgeable about and even passionately committed to cinema, and they occupied an orbit much like the post-68 active political debate on film in France by *Cahiers du cinéma*, *Cinéthique*, and *Positif*. In England Screen actively promoted the Soviet 20s, Brecht, and Godard, along with Barthes, Metz, Lacan, and Althusser. An important film studies program for U.S. students in Paris increased the interest in semiotics, psychoanalysis, and poststructuralist thought as graduate students learned about new film theories first hand. And by the later 1970s, U.S. film culture was influenced by *Screen* and by similar publications such as *Framework* and *Afterimage* from the U.K., and *Cine-Tracts* from Canada.

But that generation got older, a movie star became President, reaction had the top hand, and for many of the Baby Boomers going to the movies now meant getting a baby sitter and driving to the mall. Seeing movies was mostly done on the small tv screen with video rentals and cable tv features. Film no longer had the same intensity as part of a process of discovery and maturation as it had before. Criticism changed as well. The Hollywood auteurs of the 1970s grew older without a new generation with Something Important To Say replacing their youthful spirit. (Indeed, much of the attention that Spike Lee gets seems to come from exactly the fact that he's about the only young director with a commercial track record who wants to make a significant statement.) And today, for the most part new talents and fascinated audiences cluster not at the big urban festivals like New York or Chicago, but at locally and regionally organized festivals of gay and lesbian, feminist, African American, Latino, Asian-Pacific American, and other "minority" interest. And most of the intense, active, and concerned discussion of film and video takes place in these settings today.

The ongoing merging of film with video and television in terms of production at times, but especially in distribution and exhibition, also changes the situation. The preposterous howls of outrage which greeted the re-release of films in "colorized" versions, particularly by Ted Turner on his cable network, were the cries of an older generation of purists. Few younger people saw any problem, especially when this gave them access to films they would otherwise never see. Similarly, the cable network American Movie Classics provides 24-hour a day reruns of Hollywood films without commercials, and various extra fee cable networks regularly carry

releases only a few months after release. This and video rental allow for inexpensive repeated viewing of favorites. Clearly "movie going" means something very different in the 1990s than it did in the 1950s.

All of this has been fueled as well by changes in print journalism, the usual starting point for a body of criticism. The newspapers and general circulation magazines have declined in the United States while the special interest magazine has increased in significance. Entertainment and celebrities have become recognizable special subjects for print and broadcast journalism: thus the weekly *People* magazine, one of the highest circulation U.S. publications, features some human interest stories on unusual people, but concentrates its cover and most of its editorial space on individuals and trends in the entertainment business.

ENTERTAINMENT TONIGHT is one of the most popular nightly prime time tv shows, giving "news" updates on show business and celebrities, new releases, etc. Most cable tv offers one of several 24-hour news and feature entertainment business channels. Newspaper critics Gene Siskel and Roger Ebert not only appear on Chicago news television with recommendations and mini-reviews (most urban tv stations have such features in their news shows), but have a highly successful nationally syndicated program in which they both appear and debate the merits of the week's new releases.

Film reviewing itself has changed. Most people now get information and evaluation of new films from tv, not from print. Thus the role of the print journalism reviewer who was a paid professional writer addressing a fairly clearly defined audience in an essayistic form which allowed for the development of argumentation and examples has changed. There are fewer of them and they have less influence, while the broadcast personality who can give a short snappy summary with a few action clips occupies central position. And those who have no problem with "blurb mongering" actually produce model ad copy snippets virtually on demand of the studio publicity departments.

The growth of film courses in colleges and universities in the 1960s and 70s had the net effect of making this popular undergraduate offering part of the formal college experience for many graduates. Thus there is presumably a larger number of people who could consume sophisticated film criticism. And the establishment of various partially government subsidized media art centers, often museum cinematheques, has provided a backup to the decline of art house theaters and college film societies as venues for less commercial films.

However, it is hard to find the same passion for film as an area of personal and intellectual concern today as 20-30 years ago. Manhattan still has a diverse and substantial film audience. And one can still find eager crowds of young people at opening screenings in Westwood (Los Angeles) but much of the energy comes from the hopes they have of breaking into the industry as writers, directors, actors, or other talent. For many young people film is part of their career interests in the communications and entertainment industries, one of the very few areas of the U.S. economy which is still growing and which nets a favorable balance of trade abroad.

The development of academic film studies encouraged increased publication of longer, more serious, and more analytic criticism. At its worst, this considerable body of work has all the marks of all academic writing: formulaic thinking, pedantry, and massive irrelevance. But as a newer and emerging area within higher education, film studies have by and large been intellectually significant and opened up new areas of consideration, particularly television and the analysis of mass culture. Having developed largely within literature departments, much of the work remains ignorant of the most elementary social science perspectives and issues, but this is gradually changing with a younger generation who accept analysis of institutions and reception as equally valid as close textual and aesthetic analysis. Equally important is the recent expansion of historical studies often carefully researched and argued and based on rediscovered films and archival research. This type of traditional scholarly activity lays the groundwork for important theoretical and critical revision, while itself being guided by changes in thinking about the field that developed in recent criticism. For example, many historians now assume that it is important to investigate exhibition and audience reception as well as production and films as texts.

Film, as a canon-challenging area of studies in the 1960s and 70s university, tended to attract more liberal and adventurous students who maintained much of this perspective into the 1980s and 90s. Thus for the past few years the Society for Cinema Studies annual meeting has emphasized themes of minority perspectives and cinemas, gender politics, and third world film. Although it is easy to fault academics for not being political activists, film studies remains one of the most politically progressive areas of the U.S. university.

Against this backdrop, the critical "map" today looks something like this:

a. Intelligent and informed mass market critics in print and tv such as Siskel and Ebert who provide consumer reviews and address some aesthetic and social issues in film, often when provoked by ignorant and obnoxious critics in the same market. For example, denunciations of *DO THE RIGHT THING* by white critics who predicted it would cause race riots, or sexist men who thought *THELMA AND LOUISE* encouraged and celebrated violence against men. Some writers and intellectuals outside of film may join in these public discussions: for example, African American feminists Michelle Wallace and bell hooks (Gloria Watkins) have significant chapters on films in their recent anthologies.

b. Critics for the weekly urban hip tabloids such as the *Village Voice* (J. Hoberman, Georgia Brown) or *Chicago Reader* (Jonathan Rosenbaum) who have the time, space, and intelligent readership to give a detailed discussion to a film they consider important, to an issue they care about, or to express their own analysis or enthusiasm for a director or direction.

c. Critics for other weekly/monthly publications ranging from the weekend editions of major metropolitan newspapers where daily reviewers may have time for a "think piece" or readers of market niche (*New Yorker*) or attitude/ lifestyle (*Newsweek*, *Time*) or political sympathy (*The Nation*) may find an essayistic discussion of new releases. While close to group b above, we've separated the two

because this category seems in definite decline: the recent retirement of Pauline Kael from the *New Yorker* perhaps marks the considerable impoverishment of this part of the critical terrain. It seldom generates a discussion that seems passionate or important.

d. Journalists and writers who write about film largely for the love of it. Publications like *Cinefantastique* and *Psychotronic* are filled with dilettante love of cinema written by buffs and enthusiasts who don't have a journalist's deadline or an academic's career to worry about

e. Academic writers who are expected to do research and write about film for free as part of their job as teachers, curators, archivists, etc.. Some of these people do fundamental scholarship such as archival historical research or interviews with filmmakers, some write critical essays or theoretical pieces.

Some additional points are worth making about the "critical terrain." In the United States at present film studies has expanded to include television and video, and most of the people concerned with it intellectually also take up issues of mass culture. The term Cultural Studies is often invoked now to cover this broader range in the academic arena. It emphasizes an interdisciplinary approach often drawing on both social science and aesthetic methods. Thus, although we've listed only strictly film magazines and journals here, critical discussion of film also takes place in publications such as *Discourse*, *Cultural Studies*, *Cultural Critique*, *Representations*, *Genders*, *Artforum*, and so forth.

In addition, it needs to be noted that although the U.S. left in the past was almost obstinately blind to the area of culture other than politically militant work in a realist mode, most of the major left periodicals carry extensive cultural reviews. Elayne Rapping's analyses of popular culture in the recently defunct *Guardian* were especially fine, and Pat Aufderheide's coverage of Latin American and European cinema in *In These Times* sets a high standard. In addition left oriented publications varying from the activist-intellectual *Radical America* to *Socialist Review* and the more academic *Social Text* or the art-world-oriented *October* carry significant film articles from a progressive political perspective. Most gay and lesbian publications carry significant criticism, especially around controversial films such as *BASIC INSTINCT* or *PARIS IS BURNING*.

Finally, we must note here the importance in the United States of the technical and entertainment business press. From the very beginning technological change and innovation have played a major role in the development of cinema in the United States, affecting not just the technology, but the economics and aesthetics of Hollywood films, as well as that of documentary and independent filmmaking. One could, for example, refer to the development of soft focus photography after WW1, the coming of sound, the achievement of a practical deep-focus photography in the late 1930s, and wide screen and cinema verité in the 1950s. Informed critics should want to keep abreast of publications such as *American Cinematographer* and *Cinemeditor*, which carry detailed articles on new techniques and processes in film production which are often premiered in new releases. *Cinefex* contains detailed discussions of special effects technology and processes.

Probably the best known film publication in the world is the business publication *Variety* — both the daily and the weekly versions. There are a great number of other entertainment business publications that concentrate on different aspects of the industry. They are invaluable sources of economic information and statistics about the latest trends. Back issues are important sources for those looking into the economic history of the industry. Though perhaps not central to the critical discussion of film, these magazines devoted nearly exclusively to technology and business are very important to filmmakers, critics and scholars. We also want to mention here the important periodical bibliography, *Film/Literature Index*.

The economic basis of these various publications is important to understand because in the last case economics is usually the most important factor in the history of and actual editorial production of film criticism. Publications such as *Premiere* are clear-cut capitalist enterprises: run for a profit, making most of their money from advertising. *Premiere* sells cigarettes, alcohol, and now perfume — issues really do smell thanks to scratch-and-sniff ads). They can afford to pay writers and staff professional wages, travel expenses to do interviews, and so forth. Some publications such as *Cineaste* and *Film Quarterly* offer very modest payment to their writers, acknowledging their labor and sometimes recruiting from professional writers. At the other end are labors of love such as the fanzines.

Academic criticism falls in between. Professors are expected to write as part of their work, but not to get paid for it directly. Thus they tend to publish in nonprofit, often subsidized publications. For example, *Cinema Journal* is a benefit of membership in the Society for Cinema Studies, although non-members can subscribe. So all the members of SCS automatically get it. In contrast, *Screen* (U.K.) must compete in the U.S. market without an automatic base membership subsidy. While academic journals have traditionally charged more for institutional subscriptions to college and university libraries, they have also been secure in knowing that once carried, they would always be renewed by such libraries.

However the severe retrenchment in high education in the past few years has forced many libraries to actually cut back on subscriptions. The first to go tend to be the least-read and those less useful to undergraduates writing papers. As a result, faculty at such institutions must either carry their own personal subscription or visit a larger university library from time to time to catch up on publication in the field. Of course this slows down the topicality of research and the currentness of the exchange of ideas. So even with many more outlets for serious film writing today, the actual circulation of information and ideas may well be less. Relatively few academic periodicals are ever sold as individual copies in bookstores or newsstands. Thus relatively few potential readers will ever become aware of a new article in *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* compared with the membership-based *Cinema Journal*. And both of those publications will never begin to touch the relatively large circulation of *Film Quarterly* or *Film Comment*, which have significant newsstand and bookstore sales.

The cost of individual subscriptions is also a factor in the diffusion of knowledge. Most people can't subscribe to every film periodical they might like to read and

must pick and choose. But the cost of a sub is not always comparable. *Camera Obscura* with 6-10 articles per issue offers three issues for \$18.50, while *Screen* (U.K.) with about 4-6 articles per issue plus reports, debates, and book reviews, charges \$50.00 for four issues in the U.S.. *CineAction* (Canada) offers an individual sub in N. America for \$18 for 3 issues or \$30 for 6 issues, with about 10-12 articles per issue. *Film Quarterly* offers 4 issues for \$19.00 for individuals, while *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* charges \$63.00 for 4 issues. The British cultural studies journal *New Formations* sells for \$26.00 a single issue in the U.S. *Jump Cut* is an incredible bargain at \$14.00 for 4 issues with each issue running about 20 reviews and lengthy articles.

Finally, we must point out the extent to which the current deep recession in the United States coupled with the ongoing rightwing attack on almost all forms of culture have severely hindered the ability of U.S. intellectuals to both produce and discuss our culture. In the time that it has taken us to write this article, three noteworthy film magazines have ceased publication: (1) *American Film*, a general interest publication much like *Premiere*, (2) *Film History*, a scholarly journal, and (3) *International Documentary*, the only publication exclusively devoted to the documentary mode. And *Millimeter*, an important magazine covering technology and the film business, has not appeared in a long time and is believed to be defunct. It seems very likely that they will not be the last.

Some cause for optimism might be found in the new world of "zines," inexpensively produced and self-distributed occasional publications filled with youthful angst and attitude, idiosyncratic and often anarchist views. While they usually don't deal with films per se, but swim within and against media culture, they offer a site for a new critical practice and bear watching for that alone.

ANNOTATED LIST OF SOME U. S. FILM MAGAZINES

Afterimage: *Afterimage*, published by the Visual Studies Workshop in Rochester, New York, is a tabloid covering independent film and video as well as photography and visual books. It is probably the best single source for information on new experimental films and videos as well as the festivals and institutions concerned with media arts. The publication ranges over the history of photography, computer images, new books and works, AIDS media, censorship controversies, and contains an ample listing of classifieds for events, solicitations for festivals and shows, etc. A good amount of attention is paid to feminist and gay/lesbian work and more recently youth culture and a more extended consideration of multiculturalism and minority critiques have appeared. While covering new thought particularly as it impacts upon the media art world, *Afterimage* often seems timid about offering a thorough critique or even a controversy of opinions on subjects it favors such as gay politics, feminist theory, and postmodern representation. Essential reading for the independent sector.

American Cinematographer: Covering the field of film production, *American Cinematographer* covers the craft and people who work in studios and on location, especially in feature dramatic film. Lots of ads for production equipment and rental houses and a certain amount of celebrating famous and not so famous directors of

photography here (all-male world). The particular usefulness of the publication is its frequent detailed explanations of new production techniques and processes, particularly as they are found in newly released films. (for example, how they shot all that historical re-creation stuff for JFK).

American Cinemeditor: This publication is like *American Cinematographer* but for postproduction workers, especially film editors in Hollywood. Some interesting details of shooting special effects and computer composites on new films and some occasional career bios. Although many women have worked as film editors historically, the pictures of new members of the professional organization shows only men in the Summer '91 issue. Most curious: a photo of Oscar award winner William Reynolds (*SOUND OF MUSIC*, *THE STING*, *THE GODFATHER*), reveals a guy with a dinky 19" portable TV and a shelf of banal books. Not the glamour world often attributed to Hollywood pros. At the moment it seems that AC has ceased publication. The former editor and staff of AC have begun a new publication called *On Production*. American Cinema Editors seems prepared to begin another publication to represent the views its members. One can easily imagine that the drastic changes in postproduction technology in the last decade have led to this split in the ACE.

Asian Cinema: Reflecting the increasing interest in both East Asian and South Asian cinemas in the U.S., *Asian Cinema* is evolving into an academic journal from its beginnings as the newsletter of the Asian Cinema Studies Society. These early newsletters were designed to help academics do research on Asian cinema by alerting them to future conferences, new books, and recent articles. They contained information about the scholarly activities of Society members and contributed to building the Society. The newsletter soon developed into a magazine in which the Society's members and others could publish short articles and substantive reports on a great variety of activities of interest to scholars. The magazine's approach is very broad as befits a new area of research. As was stated in the first newsletter, they "are especially interested in focusing attention on cinemas which are considered marginal in the West and have therefore received only limited scholarly attention." The semi-annual publication ranges from carefully researched articles on regional and little known cinemas (e.g., Carol Slingo on Malayan cinema), discussions of specific films and directors, interviews, and other critical work to conference and festival reports, an ongoing bibliography, announcements of events, newly available films and videos. Essential reading for anyone with a critical interest in Asian film.

Black Film Review: The *Black Film Review* began humbly in 1985 as a xeroxed newsletter under the editorship of David Nicholson. It soon picked up the support of many critics and filmmakers. By the end of the first year it had expanded to a 24-page magazine with an editorial board. The magazine has continued to grow in size, quality, and importance ever since. Nicholson stepped down in 1989 to return to creative writing, the magazine moved out of his house, and Jacquie Jones became the editor. The *Black Film Review* has become a very important forum for the discussion of African American independent film and, to a lesser extent, the discussion of African American participation and treatment in Hollywood film.

Beyond this, however, the magazine has always had a more broadly multicultural approach. From the very beginning its editors and writers reached beyond the African American experience to see the commonalities in the experience of other disenfranchised people.

The magazine has always been open and pluralist in its approach and addressed the general reader rather than the specialist. The editors have dealt with several potentially antagonistic contradictions in very creative ways. David Nicholson announced in the very first issue his intent to deal primarily with the portrayals of African Americans in [Hollywood] film — how the characters function in the film and how realistic that is. In the very next issue a reader challenged this concentration on character (i.e. extra cinematic codes) and, quoting from Christine Gledhill, calls for a consideration of how films are actually constructed (i.e., cinematic codes).

In like fashion the magazine moved quickly to include women's voices and discussions of women's filmmaking. In the second year the magazine took up the debate around *THE COLOR PURPLE*, printing a number of differing opinions. This was soon followed by a number of articles on women filmmakers, an interest that has not abated. In fact, the first issue of 1990 has an excellent special section on African-American women filmmakers. This openness can also be seen in the magazine's willingness to deal positively with homosexuality in spite of the considerable resistance to such an approach in the African American community to this day. In the third issue of 1987 there is a special section on gay male film, centering around *LOOKING FOR LANGSTON*.

With its appeal to the general reader, *Black Film Review* tends to fall on the side of celebrating rather than thoroughly analyzing its chosen subject matter, and its format of short articles tends to leave weightier issues absent from discussion. Much more substantial and controversial discussions of issues and specific African American films have appeared in other publications. Even when a tough issue is taken on, as in Kalamu ya Salaam's essay on Black Macho in recent films, it is given only two and one-half pages of text with the promise of being continued in the next issue.

Box Office: *Box Office* is a major monthly magazine directed to the film industry. It includes lots of information about directors and their projects, actors and actresses and their careers, the concessions business, marketing and advertising. There is also specific entertainment data about films and videos. There are also short reviews of recent films as well. A special feature is their chart showing the release of feature films, organized by company.

Camera Obscura: Always intellectually rigorous, *Camera Obscura: A Journal of Feminism and Film Theory* began in the mid-1970s with particular attention to the avant-garde countercinema (Godard, Duras, Rainer) and a semiotic-psychoanalytic critique of Hollywood with translations from Christian Metz, Raymond Bellour and Thierry Kuntzel. Over time the range of interests has expanded to encompass television, popular culture, and historical analysis. The writing tends to be academic and theoretical, but within that context is clear and well-written.

Recent issues, under the editorship of Janet Bergstrom, Elisabeth Lyon, Constance Penley, Lynn Spigel, and Sharon Willis, have provided a major assessment and re-evaluation of theoretical and practical studies of female spectatorship, studies of the representation of men and male hysteria, and historical studies of early cinema. While continuing to develop its core interests while adding new ones, CO has been extremely slow in considering work by women of color (other than the most experimental/rarified as with Trinh), or to consider the cinemas of Africa, Latin America, or Asia (except for a few pieces on China). Until fairly recently the publication exuded a relentless heterosexuality, studiously avoided considering lesbian perspectives or films, and it has never given much consideration to the history and current work of women documentarists or women working in the avant-garde. While these are faults shared with much of U.S. academic feminism, an editorial in issue 25-26 indicates a desire to open up the publication to more views and debate.

Cineaste: *Cineaste* began at New York University in 1967 as a magazine for students interested in producing film criticism. Early issues covered the activities at the few university film departments that existed then-especially NYU and UCLA. However, in the heat of the radical 1960s and especially the student movement building takeovers at Columbia University and the subsequent fight, the magazine quickly became radicalized. Soon the magazine set out the topics that it would continue to cover to this day-independent political U.S. and world cinema, third world film, and "progressive" Hollywood cinema. They also began interviewing filmmakers. When we founded JUMP CUT in 1974, immediately after leaving Indiana University, *Cineaste*, as well as *Women and Film*, were our models and inspiration.

Cineaste also played an important role in connecting the 1960s radicalism to past radical filmmaking and cultural theory. For example, they published T.W. Adonto's views on the culture industry by printing a translation of an Adorno article that appeared in Germany in 1966. They also ran interviews with Leo Hurwitz about his involvement in the Film and Photo League and his own subsequent filmmaking. *Cineaste* editor Gary Crowdus worked with Tricontinental Films, the major distributor of Latin American and Third World films in the U.S. at the time and the magazine benefited with frequent articles and interviews on Third World cinema.

However, in the mid-1970s *Cineaste* backed away from the key issues in film culture at the time — film theory, feminism, and gay liberation. In fact, it might be possible to place the shift or retreat in the fourth issue of volume 4 in 1975. In that issue they interview Jane Fonda to find out to what extent she believed she could "implement her political beliefs in her film work within the industry." In the same issue Ruth McCormick reviews Christian Metz's *A Semiotics of the Cinema*. While she raises some very valid criticisms of Metz and cine-structuralism — its ahistoricism and its denial of conscious human political practice — she also sounds what will become *Cineaste*'s approach to film theory in the years to come: If the theorists cannot "make this kind of work accessible to large numbers of people," it will be "eventually relegated to the dustbin of history."

In this same issue, as well, *Cineaste* raised the issue of pornography from a libertarian perspective, warning against a "puritanism which could blind us to the free, creative and even healthy use of explicit sex in films with social value." In their approach to pornography here and in subsequent issues *Cineaste* placed itself outside the critiques of feminists, and gay male and lesbian activists. As Ronald Reagan entered the White House, *Cineaste's* drift continued. Now they were interviewing Vincent Canby, the powerful *N.Y. Times* reviewer, and expressing fawning agreement with him and Andrew Sarris, a longstanding political and aesthetic conservative as well as publishing ignorant and *ad hominem* attacks on film theory and theorists by Raymond Durgnat and Kevin Brownlow. Similarly, the publication has steadfastly ignored (though on occasion ignorantly attacked) the avant-garde movement.

Today *Cineaste* continues its original interest in politically inflected cinema and Third World film publishing important information not usually accessible elsewhere, for example on Arab cinema. The interviews remain a strong point, and sometimes include genuine surprises such a wonderful one with Dolly Parton revealing her to be a shrewd businesswoman. Occasionally opposing views on the same film brings issues into sharper relief, as with symposia on *THELMA AND LOUISE*, *DO THE RIGHT THING*, and *MALCOLM X*. The coverage of books, new independent releases and home video adds to the mix. *Cineaste* remains at its best when its writers lead from their strongest suits: Dan Georgakas providing an astute negative assessment of *DANCES WITH WOLVES* based on his longstanding interest in Native American history and Gary Crowdus offering skepticism on *ROGER AND ME* based on his autoworker family background. More perspectives by feminists, gays, and people of color have appeared in recent issues.

From the start *Cineaste* has set its style at the level of intelligent journalism making it clear and accessible, if sometimes rather bland. Its concentration on current cinema makes it always timely, but sometimes marks an ignorance of history. Its emphasis on commercial cinema is not matched by serious exploration of the economic and institutional nature of production and diffusion of that sector. *Cineaste* often seems predictable in its politics and aesthetics: nothing too extreme in either category. One senses its writers are looking for a well-made feature dramatic film that they can enjoy while feeling good politically.

Cinefantastique: The most substantial general audience publication on science fiction, fantasy, and horror, *Cinefantastique* adopts a tone of avid seriousness in covering its terrain. Heavily illustrated, the magazine emphasizes new films and TV shows in feature articles and evaluative short reviews. Some historical articles appear, often in relation to a new remake or thematic continuation. Informative and well-written, the articles often feature behind the scenes views and interviews on special effects, cinematography, and scripting.

Cinema Journal: The publication of the Society for Cinema Studies, which has about 1000 members who teach in colleges and universities, primarily in literature and other humanities based departments, *Cinema Journal* is a major and prestigious outlet for academic scholarship and criticism in the U.S. In the 1960s

and 70s, edited by Richard Dyer MacCann and later Jack C. Ellis, *Cinema Journal* almost exclusively featured historical research pieces. In part, this reflected a concern by the founders of academic film studies for recognition as a legitimate field in the university. (At that time serious writing by professors using an aesthetic/ critical approach was more likely to be found in *Film Quarterly* or *Film Comment*.)

The expansion of cinema studies in higher education and the subsequent growth of the membership brought about changes in the 1980s. Virginia Wright Wexman became editor and turned *Cinema Journal* into a traditionally run, blind refereed publication. Under this system a decision to accept or reject is based on a reading by two members of the society who do not know who wrote the article. The editor's job is largely secretarial since issues reflect the presumed best of the submissions and are not arranged by announced topic as is often the case with *Wide Angle*, *Quarterly Review of Film Studies*, and *Journal of Film and Video*. The effect was an immediate change in which critical and aesthetic based work appeared as well as articles using feminism, psychoanalysis, and semiotics. Work by junior faculty and graduate students appeared more frequently.

For a while *Cinema Journal* had a lively critical reply section in which writers responded to each other's work, however this feature disappeared under editor Dana Polan. Reflecting its membership's expertise, the publication tends to concentrate on Hollywood and west European dramatic narrative film, and more recently some U.S. television. Documentary and experimental work is sometimes considered. Social science methods remain foreign to its range of humanities based approaches. Close visual analysis is rare. A typical issue has three or four substantial articles and announcements of conferences, calls for papers, and listings of scholarly articles on film in non-film publications. A membership list and resources such as fellowship listings also appear occasionally.

Cinematograph: An occasional publication of the San Francisco Cinematheque which appears every two years or so, *Cinematograph* changes with the guest editor's focus but concentrates on the experimental side of the independent sector. Past issues have included interesting interviews with emerging filmmakers, substantial critical essays, and various documents about past and present films. Writings by both artists and critics are included, and the works and makers covered often get beyond the old guard canon and New York centered perspectives of much U.S. writing on experimental film. *Cinematograph*, No. 4 took up the topic "Non-Fiction Film? Is There Such a Thing?" and brought together a stimulating mix of different perspectives.

East-West Film Journal: *East-West Film Journal* is a relatively new publication published by the East-West Center, a U.S. government project run out of the U.S. Information Agency, a branch of the State Department. Located in Hawaii, the Center functions as a study, training, and research site for politically conservative projects and individuals which fit into government policy. The film publication claims to offer a place where "filmmakers, critics, and scholars from East and West meet as partners in a common quest to gain cultural insights from cinema." Clearly

questions of economic or cultural imperialism, the unequal power of the "partners," and the possibility that non-U.S. people might have different ideas are not on the agenda. The publication has recruited scholarly and critical articles from film studies figures such as Dudley Andrew, Nick Browne, Dana Polan, Bill Nichols, Patricia Mellencamp, Vivian Sobchak, and Paul Willemen. Just the sort of thing the ambassador or trade delegate can hand out to show the U.S. is interested in the Asian-Pacific area for more than military or economic reasons.

Film Comment: Gordon Hitchens founded *Film Comment* in 1962. At first he called it *Vision, A Journal of Film Comment*, but soon *Film Comment* became the name. During the 1960s under Hitchens' editorship the magazine was wild and eclectic, looking and sounding a lot like *Film Culture*. The magazine dealt with the avant-garde, featuring many articles by Gregory Markopoulos, documentary, animation and ethnographic films. It took strong political positions dealing with both the black list and with documentary films about the Vietnam War. It also covered many film festivals and tried to be very up-to-date about current trends in filmmaking.

Unfortunately, the magazine, also like *Film Culture*, had a great deal of difficulty raising enough money to continue publishing. Finally, in 1969 Hitchens was forced to

Thereafter the magazine became distinctly auteurist, concentrating primarily on the latest filmmaking in Europe, but also highlighting recent filmmaking in Eastern Europe, Latin American and Japan. In the early 1970s, influenced by the growing interest in European theories other than auteurism, the magazine published articles by Brian Henderson and Charles Eckert. But this flurry of excitement soon passed and the magazine returned to its auteurist approach. The focus on Hollywood in the past produced some memorable issues such as one devoted to Film Noir, but currently the policy is for a mix in each issue. Typical issues focus on new feature films of note, predominantly Hollywood but also some European art film, as well as genre studies, grouping a series together or retrospectively a director or screenwriter. There's always a sentimental look back at Hollywood such as an uncritical obituary on Frank Capra by current editor Richard T. Jameson. The publication's basic approach to cinema is conventional aesthetic appreciation with some gossip and such thrown in. Sarris still writes here occasionally, more turgid and sentimental now. Some younger critics offer a contrast, such as Jonathan Rosenbaum with forays into the Hollywood past or European cinemas. Its extensive coverage of film festivals is of some interest as well as its highlighting of emerging commercial talents.

Film Criticism: *Film Criticism* is a little magazine which prints rather mediocre essays. The publication seems to have little direction or vision of where it is going or why. Occasionally an interesting or useful piece can be found in it, but it's hard to imagine why anyone would subscribe. One of those academic publications that can be examined every few years in some extra hours at the library to see if anything of interest made it in.

Film Journal: Directed at producers, distributors and theater owners, *Film Journal*

is filled with trade news, covering the financial and commercial side of the industry. Along with the usual articles on marketing and advertising, the magazine also contains rather critical reviews of recent film releases. A special January supplement, called the Blue Sheets, gives detailed information on the up-coming studio releases planned for the year.

Film Quarterly: *Film Quarterly* began at the end of WW2 as the *Hollywood Quarterly*, concentrating on the social and cultural aspects of film and also of radio. In the 1940s various people, such as Abraham Polonsky and Sylvia Jarrico, who were blacklisted in the early 1950s, are associated with the magazine. These people disappear in the early 1950s and the journal changed its name to the *Quarterly Review of Film, Television, Radio*. An editorial explains that the editors wanted to distance themselves from the industry and become a nationally important journal. Under neither title does the journal ever mention, much less discuss, the witch-hunt against Hollywood leftists then going on. These first two incarnations were published by the University of California Press and housed on the UCLA campus. But in 1958 it dropped the interest in broadcasting and moved to Berkeley, taking its current name, *Film Quarterly*, concentrating thereafter on film criticism. Chick Callenbach, who has recently retired (succeeded by Ann Martin), became the journal's new editor in 1958. Ever since then, *Film Quarterly* has occupied a position between film criticism and film scholarship and between a progressive approach to film and society and a more narrow impressionistic and aesthetic approach.

Pushed to the left by the politics and activism of the 1960s and early 1970s, the magazine became an important early contributor to the developing radical film theory and criticism. It published important work on structuralism and semiology by Brian Henderson, Charles Eckert, and Bill Nichols. One inherent weakness in the magazine, however, and one that thwarted its development, was its near-total disregard of a feminist approach. As women became more and more central to the development of film theory and criticism, the magazine's editors retreated to a less politicized film criticism while continuing to publish useful and often important reviews of individual films and an always useful critical roundup of recent film books. The publication tended to avoid theory while, however, occasionally publishing truly weird pieces such as cranky attacks by Barry K. Salt on the work of David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson.

Articles in *Film Quarterly* are usually written in a clear and convincing style with little of the jargon of poststructuralist discourse. Major critical analyses of recent U.S. and foreign features are the norm with some occasional attention to documentary and experimental scenes. Historical analysis and detailed analytic pieces are rare.

Film Threat: This former fanzine specialty magazine, previously printed on newsprint and specializing in adolescent male fantasies and poses, has evolved into a glossier format and bills itself as "the other movie magazine." While sarcastically mocking the dominant cinema, from which its critics and the films they promote are excluded (but dying to get in on), the previous editorial direction concentrated

on grossout and shock productions, sadism and ultraviolence, splatter films and punk media. The new editorial style, upgraded in layout as well, now imitates *Spy*, the au-attitude review of life seen from a heartless and overprivileged twenty-something perspective. The Nov. 1991 issue features major fluff such as the 50 emotionally coldest actors in Hollywood and a long set of articles on child stars (mostly how bad it is to be or have been one).

In terms of actually developing a critical perspective, the magazine fails, but it does have a definite *politique des auteurs* in long favorable piece on THE DARK BACKWARD, a sick comedy aimed at the cult market, directed for \$1.2 million by Adam Rifkin who dropped out of the University of Southern California film school after a year, wrote the script and spent five years trying to peddle it before getting his break. Film Threat editor Christian Gore claims, "Not since David Lynch's ERASERHEAD has a director created such a dark, depressing and mood-heavy movie...I'd rather see a bad Adam Rifkin film than a good Blake Edwards movie."

Films in Review: Sponsored by the National Board of Review of Motion Pictures, *Films in Review* includes a great number of rather short film reviews in each issue along with several longer articles which usually highlight the work of lesser known professionals in the industry: Joseph L. Mankiewicz, Joel McCrea, Franz Waxman, John Turturro, Phyllis Thaxter. These latter articles usually include useful filmographies. There are also extensive obituaries and information about who is visiting or working in New York at the moment. Though clearly a film buffs magazine, it is filled with valuable information.

The Independent: *The Independent* began in the mid-1970s as a modest newsletter for members of the Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers (AIVF) in New York. Though still published by that organization, the newsletter, under the editorship of Martha Gever, blossomed into a very important magazine for and about independent film and video in the United States. It still performs its organizational function — providing support to producers — by printing lots of information, news, and opportunities. It is one of the best sources in the U.S. for information about the funding (or lack thereof), production, and distribution of independent work. It has been a partisan participant in the struggle for more funding from and more access to public television. And it has steadfastly defended film and video artists against government censorship. *The Independent* also prints substantial reports on film festivals around the world.

The magazine's feature articles have become increasingly important. Each issue has one to three feature articles. They include articles about or interviews with independent film and videomakers (e.g., Jon Jost and Trinh T. Minh-ha), articles about important film festivals (e.g., Berlin, Oberhausen, Leipzig, and FESPACO). On the other hand, information about and coverage of local and regional work is pretty skimpy. While its institutional analysis is outstanding, when it comes to actual criticism and analysis of specific works, *The Independent* does not print such material. Given that it is finally accountable to its membership, it would be too difficult and divisive to actually provide evaluative and analytic commentary on the work made by members of the organization. Thus what appears on specific

films tends to be about the production process or the filmmaker's own reflections on their work. At their best these are informative; at their worst they are puff pieces.

The Journal of Film and Video: The Journal of Film and Video is the official journal of the University Film and Video Association. It was founded shortly after WW2 by the earliest film (mostly production) teachers in the USA. Many of the founders had learned film production in the military during the war. Unlike the more academic Society for Cinema Studies, UFVA has always stressed, but by no means exclusively, film production, the film industry and also sociological approaches to film. Under editor Patricia Erens in the 1980s, the publication was substantially upgraded in intellectual rigor and featured thematic issues often on unusual topics such as amateur and home movie making. Issues of pedagogy and course plans are a useful staple of the journal. It continues to publish the College Course File series begun years ago by the American Film Institute. A Course File is an annotated outline for a university course on a given subject. This series is very useful to all university teachers, but especially to newcomers, because it gives a good sense of what people are doing and what can be done. Articles on screenwriting and production process find their home here along with academic studies representing the current range of interests of the members. Recent editor Michael Selig organized both general issues and thematic ones.

The Journal of Popular Film and Television: The Journal of Popular Film and Television was founded as the *Journal of Popular Film* in 1972 as a spin-off from the *Journal of Popular Culture*. It was then and remains today a publication of the Popular Culture Center at Bowling Green University in Ohio. The Center and its journals were the product of and the organizing center of a large and broad movement in U.S. academic life to take all forms of popular culture seriously. They founded a national and regional organizations with annual meetings. Because no subject was beneath their interest and concern, their meetings were lively and interesting. The main strength of this movement was the way in which people meticulously gathered great amounts of data about their subjects. Thus their back issues are filled with a wealth of interesting and often hard to get information about a great range of subjects having to do with popular culture and the media. Its weakness has always been that their ignorance of or opposition to any form of theory left them nearly helpless in the face of the facts and material evidence they had gathered.

In the early issues of the journal can be found important early work on genre films by academics such as Stuart Kaminsky and Jack Nachbar. Most of the early contributors are men and the journal seemed unaffected by the many theoretical currents that became important in the mid-1970s, including feminism or the culture of Third World people here and abroad. In 1979 the journal changed its name to indicate their interest in television and in the 1980s some of the theoretical concerns of the 1970s began to find their way into the journal. Recent issues have dealt with feminist views of sexuality, the commodification of perception and psychoanalysis and cinema.

U.S. film periodicals

page 2

from *Jump Cut*, no. 38, June 1993, pp. 105-122

copyright *Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media*, 1993, 2006

Jump Cut: Since 1974, *Jump Cut: A Review of Contemporary Media*, has combined a political activist orientation with a range of writing styles from the evaluative journalistic review to the more "objective" academic article. Among U.S. publications with an open progressive politics, it is often more academic than *Cineaste*, but often more journalistic than *Camera Obscura*. With an editorial position from the start openly committed to Marxism and feminism, the publication has declared its concern to develop an analysis that recognizes the interrelationship of class, race, and gender. In addition to reviews of new films (always some Hollywood, but also art house features, documentary, and experimental) the publication regularly features special sections on issues such as gay film, lesbian criticism, new theory, Latin American cinema, African and African diaspora work, sexual representation, China, Cuba, and ideological critiques of the mainstream.

Jump Cut has gone through various transformations: once a newsprint tabloid appearing 6 times a year, it is now a book length magazine format annual and moving away from a period of staff collectivity, it is now co-edited by its founders, John Hess, Chuck Kleinhans, and Julia Lesage. Always outspoken about the issues which concern it, the publication has been at the center of some critical controversies. Critics complain of its self-righteous editorial tone, while supporters admire its willingness to frankly state its political agenda in an intellectual climate where many declare an "interest" in Marxism, multiculturalism, feminist or gay issues but won't come out and accept the label. Although most of its writers are academics, the publication maintains a high degree of readability.

Lightstruck: A somewhat erratic publication that evolved out of a newsletter, *Lightstruck* provides information and critical articles from the Experimental Film Coalition. In addition to regular news, reports from regions about screenings, announcements of new work completed, and a regular tech column, the magazine covers larger critical and aesthetic questions in interviews, statements by filmmakers, and occasional critical essays. While some controversy emerges from time to time (e.g., is there a place for documentary or dramatic narrative in the avant-garde?), the general tone reflects traditional individual artist Romantic aesthetics typical of the New American Cinema movement of the 1960s. Video is regarded with great suspicion, if not hostility. Politically or ethically committed

work seems intelligible here only if strongly related to the maker's individual consciousness. Relations with adjoining arts such as music, performance, and video appear very marginal, and there's little sense of engagement with the issues that have so engaged the art world in the late 1980s and early 90s: AIDS, censorship, the Gulf War and other imperial extensions, gay and lesbian issues, race and ethnic difference and discrimination, sexuality and gender issues, funding cuts and so forth.

Millennium Film Journal: Published by Millennium, the New York City avant-garde film showcase and production facility, the publication takes experimental film as its central concern, most notably in critical essays on recent work. In the early 1980s *MFJ* was somewhat unfairly characterized as presenting graduate student term papers from the New York University Cinema Studies Department orthodoxy. However the publication also included discussions of European and Latin American film, some feminist, political, and historical analysis, and an interest in more theoretical concerns, reflecting the range of one of its principal co-editors, Noel Carroll. Issue 16/17/18 presented a notable 20 year retrospective on Millennium and the avant-garde scene with an excellent analysis by Paul Arthur and interesting views by Fred Camper and Annette Michelson. More recently, edited by Tony Pipolo and Grahame Weinbren, it has turned to the unfortunate weaknesses of avant-garde criticism: puff pieces for filmmakers with a "script issue" and uncritical interviews with well-established figures. Predictably, *Millennium Film Journal* reflects the New York City parochialism of its parent showplace, and pays little attention to the rest of the country or to adjacent areas such as video and performance art. Given the general concern in the U.S. art world with issues of sexuality, gender politics, multiculturalism, and state censorship since the mid-80s, *MFJ*, dependent on National Endowment for the Arts funding, seems incredibly conservative in its resolute silence on such matters. With the demise of the more adventurous *Motion Picture*, from the now defunct Collective for Living Cinema, one must look to *Afterimage* and *Cinematograph* for lively coverage of the experimental scene.

Movieline: Another recent bid in the film fluff journalism market (compare *Film Threat*), the March 1992 issue of *Movieline* offers a survey of Young Hollywood including the stars favorite drugs and how they get them, a puff piece on back-from-drugs Drew Barrymore, and what-we-always-suspected in an article by Stephan Farber: "The studios are hiring more first-time directors than ever before. A movie revolution? Hardly. These kids work cheap and are easier to keep in line." An interesting take on the glamour and glitz as seen by people who are also aware of the downside and economic underbelly of the monster.

Off Hollywood Report: Formerly *Montage*, a publication of the Independent Feature Project, an organization aiding people interested in making dramatic films outside of the traditional studio system, the publication has news and notes, and information on legal and financial aspects of the business (such as how to option films, working with limited partnerships, etc.), coverage of emerging directors, screenwriters, and works in planning or production. The whole world of auteur cinema wannabees, the latest on the aspiring crowd, is present. Indispensable for

those who are trying to track new directorial talent in the world of dramatic features, and revealing on the complexities of today's market.

Persistence of Vision: This annual academic journal is published by the film faculty of the City University of New York. The issues are usually organized around specific issues, such as New German Cinema, U.S. film in the 1970s, Genre, and early cinema. Though there are no editorials setting out the magazines policies or desired direction, the writers tend to see things in some sort of social or film historical context — Wells and the industry or historical consciousness in Dryer's work.

Post Script: An academic journal subtitled "Essays in Film and the Humanities," *Post Script* presents a very eclectic mix of articles with no apparent direction. It is neither very theoretical nor very political. It includes some interviews with independent filmmakers and industry craftspeople. The journal does publish a quite extensive and thus valuable Annual Bibliography.

Premiere: *Premiere: The Movie Magazine*, a Hollywood-centered glossy, has smiling stars on its cover and lots of puff piece features on the inside promoting forthcoming films in every imaginable way: on the set interviews, star bios, special effects features, screenwriter and producer features and featurettes. Snappy visuals and prose are its strongest features, but it's difficult to figure out precisely what readership the editors imagine when they have to caption a photo of Alfred Hitchcock and David O. Selznick to identify which one is Hitch. Again and again the magazine directly addresses or returns to questions of movies as a business. But instead of the hard facts of *Hollywood Reporter* or *Variety*, *Premiere* seems oriented to armchair wannabees. The information isn't current or solid enough to be useful for making investment decisions or career moves. *Premiere* seems like the consummate movie magazine of the Reagan-Bush era following high rolling entertainment business decisions and charting whose career is going up or down as spectator sport.

Psychotronic Video: In sharp contrast to the sour-grapes wannabees at *Film Threat*, the *Psychotronic* crew is totally and passionately committed to films on the margins, particularly horror, gore, and exploitation. In their devotion they scrupulously assemble the bits and pieces of history and criticism. Extended filmographies and interviews are particularly strong, and equally obsessed readers send in endless corrections and additions with an attention to detail and accuracy seldom seen in academic film study. The near obsession extends to detailed interviews with and articles on B film figures such as actors David Carradine, James Coburn, and Peter Fonda, and director Robert Wise, as well as topics such as horror in Spain, odd sci-fi, old roadshow films from the 1940s, extended coverage of local and special interest fanzines, and assorted news and gossip. Every issue also includes reviews of related books and records, descriptive reviews of re-releases on video and lots of ads for small specialty video distributors.

Editor Michael Weldon, author of *The Psychotronic Encyclopedia of Film* (NY: Ballantine, 1983), combines the right mix of nerdy attention to detail, wide ranging lowbrow taste, and a sense of proportion and humor to make *Psychotronic Video*

readable and useful. The basic editorial attitude to the films and careers is respectful. The offbeat energy and gleams of originality in the less-than-banal films covered justifies the enterprise and calls for an enthusiastic and non-cynical response.

Quarterly Review of Film and Video: Begun in the late 1970s as *The Quarterly Review of Film Studies*, the publication announced its intention of being an active review journal, paying particular attention to the critical examination of scholarship and criticism in the field. That goal changed and the publication quickly evolved into a usually thematically organized quarterly that seemed filled with typical to excellent conference papers on U.S. and Western European cinema. Owned by a commercial publisher who gradually went under in the mid-80s, the publication reemerged under the ownership of Harwood Academic, a Swiss firm. Announcing a new look and wider set of concerns while finishing off a backlog of issues, the late Katherine S. Kovacs became editor in 1989. Again thematic issues, often guest-edited, seemed the norm, though the overall intellectual quality increased. A wider range of interests, including TV and video and a broader conception of international studies seems indicated as well under new editor Michael Renov. Forthcoming issues include television studies, "questioning the national," gay and lesbian representations, and Black feminism and media.

Sightlines: *Sightlines* is the publication of the American Film and Video Association (AFVA) and is the most important source of information about educational film and video in the U.S. It is very important to schools, libraries, archives, and other institutions that buy and collect films and videos, especially because each issue includes a list of new releases on film, video, and laser disc of every imaginable type of work — from old Hollywood movies to short educational documentaries. The magazine contains important information about distribution, including the names and addresses of the distributors of all the media mentioned in each issue. It continuously updates its readers about new exhibition equipment and technologies. For example, the fall, 1990, issue contains two articles on laser discs, explaining a brief history of the technology, how it has been used, how to take care of it, and how to talk about it (a glossary of terms for talking about interactive multimedia).

Spectator: *Spectator* is a student published journal from the School of Cinema-Television at the University of Southern California. It features reworked student research and critical essays, many interesting and intelligent, though often heavily indebted to critical jargon. The subject range is quite wide, and some articles appear with a definite political orientation, particularly feminist analyses.

The Velvet Light Trap: In the 1970s *The Velvet Light Trap* was one of the more important U.S. film magazines. It was brought out by the "film community of Madison," Wisconsin, that is current and former students of film at the main campus of the University of Wisconsin in Madison. The campus had become the repository for the papers of several Hollywood studios and the film students had access to these records. The magazine was prominent for its interest in and analysis of Hollywood studio productions, often from an historical perspective.

Special issues dealt with the actor, RKO studio, the western, the 1950s, and history films. Only very occasionally did they deal with foreign films (an issue on French Cinema) or newer Hollywood films. The magazine became more and more infrequent and finally ceased publication altogether in the mid-1980s only to be reborn again recently in a shared editorship with students at the University of Texas, another premiere archive for film history studies.

Though often providing interesting and hard to find information about the Hollywood production process and the studios, the magazine also expressed a nearly film buff approach, eschewing almost entirely the various theories and debates about film that so dominated film studies in the late 1970s and early 1980s. There is little evidence in the magazine of an awareness of anything else going on outside the confines of the library and screening room. Nonetheless, more recent issues have begun to include feminist, gay male and lesbian perspectives. The magazine is now a valuable source of information on critical views of Hollywood studio filmmaking and is open to considering more offbeat topics such as exploitation films.

Visions: A quarterly magazine about film, video, and performance arts, published by the Boston Film! Video Foundation, typifies a new development in media publication: the regional newsletter/magazine. Various media art centers around the U.S., typically supported by a combination of National Endowment for the Arts money, state and regional grants, and donations from private foundations, business and individual donors, help support the production and/or diffusion of independent creative work. Some offer equipment, facilities, and services, while others provide distribution and exhibition, and some do both. Newsletters provide a useful vehicle for keeping in touch with a diverse and fluid membership and constituency, and the advent of widespread computer based "desktop publishing" has lowered publishing production costs while usually improving the presentational quality of the newssheets. Typical is *Release Print* from the Film Arts Foundation in the San Francisco Bay area. Some of these local/regional based efforts evolve into full fledged magazines with enough substance to be valuable as national publications, such as *IMAGEnews* from Atlanta's Image Film/ Video Center.

Visions, recently begun by New England's largest media arts center, offers the standard news and networking info, and a good deal more. Festival reports in the Fall 1991 issue included Gerald Peary on Troia (Portugal) and Elrieda Abbe on Chicago's Women in the Director's Chair. A review of Marlon Riggs' new tape on Blacks in prime time TV, *COLOR ADJUSTMENT*, appears as well as an interview with Juliet Bashore on *KAMIKAZE HEARTS*, her docufiction film on lesbians in the het porn film business. The cover story and interview highlighted a local success, *GANG PEACE*, a video made by young African Americans who learned their craft as part of BFI's training program.

Wide Angle: *Wide Angle* is a publication of the Ohio University Film Department and has over the years published important work by many of the leading U.S. film scholars. In fact, in reviewing back issues, one finds many articles which

subsequently became the basis for books. Yet the material is usually so narrowly conceived and isolated from any historical moment and/or social practice that the articles often seem more precious and esoteric than they actually are. The magazine tends to focus each issue on a single topic and these cover a very wide range — Godard, Film History, the 1920s, Feminism, Bazin, Television, etc. It is a good indicator of what university-based film studies teachers and scholars are thinking. However, like many academic magazines, *Wide Angle* exhibits little continuity or editorial direction. Instead, it seems more like an anthology of the year's scholarly writing on film. This sense of drift has intensified since Peter Lehman, a co-founder, stepped down in 1985. Since then there have been a series of young editor-scholars who the university hires to teach, edit the magazine, and run their annual conference. They usually burn out in a few years from this workload and move on. Thus no editor ever gets the opportunity to give a sense of direction to the magazine.

PUBLICATION DATA

Adam Film World Guide, 8060 Melrose Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90046. 213/653 8060. Lists distributors, producers, and other companies involved in heterosexual adult videos as well as reviews of several hundred recent tapes. \$6.95 each.

Afterimage, ed. Grant H. Kester and Nadine L. McCann. Visual Studies Workshop. 31 Prince Street, Rochester, NY 14607. 716/442-8676. ISSN 0300-7472. Began 1973. Membership: \$30, inst \$40/ foreign: \$35, instit \$45. 20 pg. tabloid.

AFVA Bulletin, ed. Casey Ashe. 920 Barnsdale Road, Suite 152, LaGrange Park, IL 60525. 708/482-4000. Pub. of American Film & Video Association., concentrates on educational market.

American Cinematographer, ed. George Turner. Circ. 30,000. Box 2230, Los Angeles, CA 90028. 213/876-5080/fax: 213/ 876-4973. ISSN 0002-7928. Began 1919. Monthly, \$24/Can&Mex: \$39/Foreign: \$49. Technical magazine.

American Cinemeditor. Cite. 9,500. P.O. Box 16490, Encino, CA 91416-6490. 818/9076682. Publication of Cinema Editors (ACE). ISSN 0044-7625. It has ceased publication, followed by *On Production*, a new mag. Began 1950. Technical.

American Classic Screen, ed. John C. Tibbetts. Cite. 20,000. Box 7150, Shawnee Mission, KS 66207. 913/341-1919. ISSN 0195-8267. Began 1977. bi-monthly \$15.

American Film, ed. Wolf Schneider. Circ.135,000. 6671 Sunset Blvd. #1514, Hollywood, CA 90028. 213/856-5350. ISSN 0361-4757. Defunct, began 1975 by the American Film Institute, then turned over to private ownership. Even with this headstart, these capitalists couldn't make it ago.

American Premiere, ed. Susan Royal. Cite. 17,500. 8421 Wilshire Blvd., Penthouse Ste., Beverly Hills, CA 90211. ISSN 0279-0041. Formerly *Premiere*. Began 1979. Monthly \$16.

Animation Magazine, ed. Terry Thoren. Cite. 25,000. P.O. Box 25547, Los Angeles, CA 90025. Covers technical aspects of computer animation, commercials, video and features. Began 1987. Quarterly \$15.

Animator, ed. Kathy Clark. Circ. 2,000. 1219 S. W. Park Ave., Portland, OR 97205. 503/ 2211156. Pub by Oregon Art Institute and Northwest Film & Video Center. ISSN 0889-5589. Information, interviews and resources for film and video makers and for public relations firms. Newsletter. Began 1971. q \$6/\$ 10.

Art and Cinema, ed. Daryl Chin. Circ. 5,000. P.O. Box 1208, Imperial Beach, CA 92032.

Asian Cinema, ed. Mira Reym Binford. Quinnipiac College, Box 91. Hamden, CT 06518-0569. Publication of Asian Cinema Society. Began 1985. 2 issues/yr membership or \$12/Inst \$20. 36 pg.

Back Stage, ed. Richard Miller. Cite. 31,000. 330 W. 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017. 212/947-0020/Fax: 212/967-6786. Began 1960. weekly \$45.

Back Stage Film-Tape Syndication. Circ. 7,000. 330 W. 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017. 212/947-0020/Fax: 212/967-6786. Lists producers and services of non-theatrical and industrial films and videos. Began 1965. annual \$35

Big Reel, ed. Donald R. Key. Circ. 4000. Rte. 3, Box 83, Madison NC 27025. 919/427-5850. Forum for film buffs to buy, trade and sell films, photos, tapes, pubs, posters, projectors. Began 1973. monthly \$20.

Black Film Review, ed. Jacquie Jones. Cite. 1,000. 2025 Eye Street NW, #213, Washington, DC 20006. 202/466-2753. ISSN 08875723. Began 1985. quarterly \$12, inst \$24/ foreign: \$22, inst /\$34.34 pg.

Bondage, ed. Richard Schenkman. Cite. 6,000. P.O. Box 414, Bronxville NY 10708. James Bond 007 Fan Club. Began 1973. annual \$16.

Bondage Quarterly, PO Box 414, Bronxville NY 10708-0414. James Bond 007 Fan Club. Began 1973. Quarterly/membershp.

Box Office, ed. Harley W. Lond. Circ. 10,000. 6640 Sunset Blvd, #100, Hollywood CA 90028. 213/465-1186/fax: 213/4655049. ISSN 0006-8527. The business magazine of the motion picture industry. Began 1920. m \$35/Can&Mex \$45/other \$60.

Camera Obscura, eds. Janet Bergstrom. Elisabeth Lyon. Constance Penley, Lynn Spigel, Sharon Willis. Circ. 3,000. P.O. Box 25899, Los Angeles CA 900025. Johns Hopkins U Press. ISSN 0270-5346. Presents current perspectives on the national and int'l film scene. Began 1976. 3 yr \$18, Inst: \$351 foreign — \$25, inst \$42.50. 200 pg.

Castle Dracula, ed. Gordon R. Guy. P.O. Box 423, Glastonbury, East Hartford CT 06033. Dedicated to the appreciation, promotion & preservation of supernatural

fiction in lit, films, theater, TV. Began 1967. q \$7.

Cineaste, ed. Gary Crowdus. Circ. 7,000. 200 Park Ave. So., New York NY 10003. 212/982-1241. ISSN 0009-7004. Began 1967. q. \$13, Inst \$21/foreign: \$19, inst \$25. Mpg.

Cinefan, ed. Randall D. Larson. Circ. 1,000. P.O. Box 70868, Sunnyvale CA 94086. 408/ 226-9339. ISSN 0277-5891. Presents interviews, retros on sci-fi, fantasy and horror films with emphasis on foreign, independents, obscure. Began 1974. 3/yr \$7.

Cinefantastique, ed. Frederick S. Clarke. Circ. 20,000. P.O. Box 270. Oak Park IL 60303. 708(366-5566. ISSN 0145-6032. Began 1970. 6/yr \$18/foreign: \$21. 62 pg.

Cinefex, ed. Don Shay. Circ. 15,000. P.O. Box 20027, Riverside CA 92516. Technical, about effects. Began 1980. q \$22. 58 pg.

Cinema Journal, ed. David Desser. Circ. 1,000. U of IL, Cinema Studies, Urbana IL 61801. 217/244-2705; fax: 24.4(2233. Published by U of Illinois Press for Society for Cinema Studies. ISSN 0009-7101. Began 1961. q\$20. inst \$25. 9Opg.

Cinema News, ed. Don Dohler. Circ. 3,000. 12 Moray Court, Baltimore MD 21236. Formerly Amazing Cinema. Began 1981. 3/yr \$7.

Cinemacabre, ed. George Stover. Circ. 3,000. P.O. Box 1005, Baltimore MD 21285. 301/8280286. ISSN 0198-1064. Fan mag. Began 1979. m \$10 for 3 mos.

Cinemascore: The Film Music Journal, ed. Randall Larson. Circ. 2,000. P.O. Box 70868, Sunnyvale CA 94086. 408/226-9339. ISSN 0277-9803. Technical with interviews, reviews & retros on the art and tech of music for motion pictures. Began 1979. semi-a \$13.

Cinematograph, guest editors, no regular editor. Circ. 1,000. 480 Potrero, San Francisco CA 94110. 415/558-8129. Pub. by Foundation of Art in Cinema, San Francisco Cinematheque. ISSN 0886-6570. Began 1985. annual \$9/foreign: \$20/all inst \$20. 200 pg. Experimental and independent cinema.

Cinemonkey, ed. Douglas HoIm. 1435 N. E. 72nd, Portland OR 97213. 503(248-0849. ISSN 0162-0126. Formerly Scintilat ion. Began 1976. Irreg. \$7

CineVue, ed. Bill J. Gee. Circ. 16,000. 32 East Broadway, New York NY 10002. 212/925-8685. Pub. by Asian CineVision, Inc.. Began 1986. 5/yr \$10.

Classic Images, ed. Sue Laimans. Circ. 3,000. P.O. Box 809, Muscatine IA 52761. 31912632331. ISSN 0275-8423. Formerly Classic Film- Video Images, Classic Film Collector. Eight MM Collector. Began 1962. m\$25.

Columbia Film View, ed. Jennifer Robinson, David Wezoer. Circ. 1,000. 513 Dodge Hall. New York NY 10027. 212/280-2842. Pub. by Columbia University School of the Arts, Film Division. Formerly *Columbia Film Review*. Began 1985. 3/yr \$7.50.

CTVD. Cinema TV-Digest, ed. Ben Hamilton. 550 Rte. 1, P.O. Box 202, Newberry SC 29108. 8031276-6870. ISSN 0007-9219. Began 1962. Irreg. \$3 for 4 nos.

Current Research in Film, ed. Bruce Austin. 355 Chestnut Street, Norwood NJ 07648. 201/767-8450. Pub. by Ablex. ISSN 07488580. Began 1985. Book format annual covers audience and economic studies. Price varies.

East-West Film Journal, eds. Wimai Dissanayake, Paul Clark, John Chariot. Circ. 300. 1777 East-West Road, Honolulu HI 96848. 808944-7302/fax: 8081944-7670. Pub. by Hawaii Press, Journals Dept. for Inst. of Culture & Communication, East-West Center. ISSN 0891-6780. Began 1986. semi-an. US & Can: \$15, inst: \$25/foreign: \$25, inst \$30. 64 pg.

Fangoria, classic horror fan magazine.

Field of Vision, ed. Robert A. Hailer. Circ. 600. 135 St. Paul's Ave., Staten Island NY 10301. Began 1976. annual \$12. Irregular, experimental and holography.

Filement, ed. Glenn Lalach. Circ. 1,500. Dept of Theatre Arts, Wright State University, Dayton 01145435. Began 1981. Free.

Film and History, ed. John E. O'Conner. Circ. 450. Historians Film Committee History, NJ Inst of Tech., Newark NJ 07102. 201/ 596-3291. ISSN 0360-3695. Supersedes Historians Film Committee Newsletter. Began 1972. q \$12.

Film Comment, ed. Richard T. Jameson. Circ. 35,000. Film Society of Lincoln Center, 70 Lincoln Center Plaza New York NY 10023. 212/877-1800/fax: 212(724-2813. ISSN 0015-119X. Began 1962. 6/yr. \$19.95/ foreign: \$45. 80 pg.

Film Criticism, ed. Lloyd Michaels. Circ. 400. Allegheny College, Meadville PA 16335. Began 1976. 3/yr. \$9/Inst. \$10.

Film Culture, ed. Jonas Mekas. 32 Second Ave., New York NY 10003. Began 1955. Devolved into coverage of the old New American Cinema patriarchs and then ceased publication during the 1980's; recently revived, it continues to celebrate the avant garde of the early 60's. 4/yr. \$20.

Film History: An International Journal, ed. Richard Koszarski. Circ. 1900. Frost Road, Ste. 101, Bristol PA 19007. 215/785-5800/ Fax: 215/785-5515. ISSN 0892-2160. Defunct, 1991; began 1987. q \$80.

Film Journal, ed. Robert Sunshine. Circ. 10,500. 244 W. 49th St., Ste. 305, New York NY 10019. 212/246-6460/fax: 21212656428. ISSN 0199-7300. NB: Jan supplement, Blue Sheets, giving details of coming releases. Began 1934. m \$40.78 pg.

Film Literature Index, eds. Linda Provinzano & Deborah Sternldar. Film & TV Doc Ctr, Richardson 390C, SUNY, Albany NY 12222. ISSN 0093-6758. Began 1973. q \$300/foreign: \$325.

Film Quarterly, ed. Anne Martin. Circ. 6,400. 2120 Berkeley Way, University of California Press, Berkeley CA 94720. 510/ 6426333. ISSN 0015-1386. Began 1945. q \$15, inst \$30/foreign: \$20, inst \$35. 64 pg.

Film Threat, ed. Christian Gore. P.O. Box 951, Royal Oak, MI 48068. 313/545-4673. ISSN 0896-6389. Fan magazine. Began 1991. 6/yr — \$16/foreign: \$26. 70 pg.

Film World, ed. Tim Connelly. Circ. 150,000. 8060 Melrose Ave., Los Angeles CA 90046. 213/653-8060. Began 1968. m \$1350. Reviews and features on heterosexual porn industry.

Filmmakers Review, ed. Jim Berger. Circ. 5,000. Columbia Filmmakers, 313 Ferris Booth Hall, Columbia University, New York NY 10027. Began 1976. q \$15.

Films in Review, ed. Robin Little. Circ. 8,600. P.O. Box 589, New York NY 10021. 212/6281594. Pub. by Nat'l Board of Review of Motion Pictures. ISSN 0015-1688. Began 1950. 6/yr. \$18/foreign: \$22. 70 pg.

Freedonia Gazette, ed. Paul G. Wesolowski. Circ. 400. Darien 28, New Hope PA 18938. 215/862-9734. ISSN 0748-5247. Fan magazine devoted to the Marx Brothers. Began 1978. semi-a \$8.

Freeze Frame, ed. Jennifer Heuff. P.O. Box 89. San Francisco CA 94101-0089. 415/4313886. Pub. by Northern CA Women in Film and TV.

Gore Zone, ed. Anthony Timpone. Circ. 180. 475 Park Ave. So., New York NY 10016. 212/689-2830. Fan magazine pub. By O'Quinn Studios. ISSN 0896-8802. Began 1988. bi-m \$15.99.

Hollywood Stuntmen's Hall of Fame News, ed. John Gilbert Hagner. Circ. 375. 111 E. 100 North. Box 277, Moab UT 84532. 801/ 259-6100. Began 1978. 6/yr \$27.50. Fan.

Hollywood Magazine, ed. Al Austin. 7000 Hollywood Blvd.. Cabana 9, Hollywood CA 90028. 213/856-9022. Celebrity profiles, behind-the-scenes on filmmaking. TV & music industries, new films, fashion, architecture. Began 1988. bi-m \$10.

Hollywood Reporter, ed. Alex Ben Block. Cite. 25,000. 6715 Sunset Blvd., Hollywood CA 90028. 213/464-7411/fax:213/4698770. ISSN 0018-3660. Began 1930. daily \$1421 foreign \$150, air: \$50/Weekly Edition: \$150.

Hollywood Studio Magazine, ed. Ralph Benner. Circ. 50,000. 3960 Laurel Canyon Ave., Studio City CA 91604. 818/990-5450. Began 1953. 12/yr \$25.97.

In Cinema, ed. Harlan Jacobson. Circ. 605,000. Second Ave. New York NY 10017. Began 1980. 10/yr \$10

Independent, The. Ed. Patricia Thomson. Circ. 4,000. 625 Broadway. 9th Floor,

New York NY 10012. 212/473-3400/fax:21217322252. Pub. of the Foundation for Independent Film and Video. ISSN 0731-5198. 10/yr \$45: St \$60.56 pg.

International Documentary, ed. Denise Bigio. Circ. 2,000. 1551 5. Robertson Blvd. Ste 201, Los Angeles CA 90035. 213/655-7089/ Fax: 2131785-9334. Pub. of Int'l Documentary Association. ISSN 0742-5333. Defunct, began 1982. q \$15/Inst. \$25.40 pg.

Journal of Film and Video, ed. Frank Tomasub, Film/Video, Georgia State Univ., University Plaza, Atlanta GA 30303.404/6513200. Cue. 1,300. Pub. of UFVA, Division of Mass Communications. ISSN 0742-4671. Began 1947. Members only. 134 pg.

Journal of Popular Film and Television, eds. Michael Marsden, John o. Nachbar. Circ. 800. Popular Culture Center, Bowling Green State Univ., Bowling Green OH 43403.202/ 3626445. ISSN 0195-6051. Began 1971. q \$24, St \$48.40 pg.

JUMP CUT, eds. John Hess. Chuck Kleinhans, Julia Lesage. Circ. 5,000. P.O. Box 865, Berkeley CA 94701.510/658-4482. ISSN 0146-5546. Began 1974.4 issues: \$14. inst \$20/foreign: \$16. inst \$22, air add \$20. 124 pg.

Kaleidoscope, eds. Don Shay, Ray Cabana, Jr.. Circ. 1,000.45-B Gail Street, Springfield, MA 01108. ISSN 0022-7919. Began 1965. 3/yr \$2.

Landers Film Reviews, ed. Bertha Landers. Circ. 3,600. P.O. Box 27309, Escondido CA 92027.

Lightstruck, Experimental Film Coalition, Filmmaking Dept. School of the Art Institute of Chicago, Columbus and Jackson, Chiago IL 60603. Began 1983. q \$1STmst \$35. 54 pg.

Literature/Film Quarterly, ed. James M. Welsh. Cire. 700. Salisbury State University, Salisbury MD 21801. 301/543-6000. ISSN 0090-4260. Began 1973. q \$14/inst \$28. 68 pg. Academic.

Media Arts, ed. Douglas W. Edwards. Circ. 12,000. 8949 Wilshire Blvd. Beverly Hills CA 90211. Pub. by National Association of Media Art Centers.

Millennium Film Journal, eds. Tony Pipolo and Grahame Weinbren. 66 East 4th Street, New York NY 10003. Began 1980. 3/yr \$14, inst & foreign: \$20. 78 pg.

Millimeter, ed. Alison Johns. Circ. 30,000. P.O. Box 95759, Cleveland OH 44101. 212/ 4774700. ISSN 0164-9655. Defunct, began 1973. m \$60.

Motion Picture, ed. Marjorie Keller. 41 White Street, New York NY 10013. Pub. of Collective for a Living Cinema. Defunct.

Motion Picture Investor, 126 Clock Tower Place. Cannel CA 93923. 408-624-1536. Pub, by Paul Kegan Associates. ISSN 07428839. Covers investment in public and private movie prod'n and distribution companies; tracks value of motion pic stocks.

Began 1984. m \$475.

Movie Mirror, ed. Joan Goldstein. 355 Lexington Ave., New York NY 10017.212/9496850. ISSN 0027-271X. Began 1957. bi-m \$9.

Movieline. eds. Virginia Campbell and Edward Margulies. Cue. 100,000. 1141 S. Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills CA 90035.310/ 282-0711/fax: 310/785-9566. ISSN 10550917. Highlights lifestyles of moviemakers. Began 1989.. 11/yr \$15/foreign: \$36. 96 pg.

Movies USA. Cite. 999,999. 8010 Roswell, Ste 212, Atlanta GA 30350.404/668-0111. Began 1988. m \$18.

Movietone News, ed. Richard T. Jameson. Circ. 1,000. 6556 Palatine Ave., N. Seattle, WA 98103. 206/782-0505. Pub. of Seattle Folklore Society. Began 1971. 10/yr \$7/Inst. \$10. Defunct?

Off-Hollywood, ed. Scott Macaulay. 132 West 21st Street, 6th floor, New York NY 10011. 212/243-7777/fax: 212/243-3882. ISSN 1045-1706. Began 1987. q \$12/institut and foreign: \$35/students: \$10.50 pg.

On Location, ed. Steven Bernard. P.O. Box 2810. Hollywood CA 90028.213/467-1268. ISSN 0149-7014. Began 1977. m \$66.

On Production, ed. Howard Kenin. 17337 Ventura Blvd. #226, Encino CA 91316. 818/ 9076682. ISSN 0044-7625. New technical pub with same staff as *American Cinemeditor* (a split). Began 1992- 6/yr \$16.50. 48 pg.

Persistence of Vision, eds. Tony Pipolo, et al. Circ. 500.53-2463rd Street, Maspeth NY 11378.718/779-3936. Pub. of Film Studies, CUNY. Began 1984. 3/yr \$15. 120 pg.

Photo Screen, ed. Marsha Daly, 355 Lexington Ave., New York NY 10017.212/9496850. ISSN 0031-8566. Began 1965. bi-m \$6.

Post Script. eds. Gerald Duchovnay, J.P. Telone. Circ. 350. Jacksonville University Jacksonville FL 32211. Pub by East Texas State University. Began 1980. 3/yr \$12.inst: \$17 /foreign: \$20, Inst \$25. 124 pg.

Premiere, ed. Susan Lyne. Circ. 375,000.2 Park Ave., New York NY 10016.21Z(7257926/fax: (212) 725-3442. Pub. by Murdoch Magazines (Tarrytown). Fills journalistic gap between scholarly film and fan mags; interviews and articles about current film. Began 1987. m \$18/foreign: \$42. 104 pg.

Psychotronic Video, ed. Michael Weldon, 151 First Ave., New York NY 10003. 212/ 6733823. Fan magazine. 6/yr \$20/Can: \$22/ foreign: \$45. 64 pg.

Quarterly Review of Film and Video, ed. Michael Renov. Circ. 1,000. School of CinemaTV, USC, Los Angeles CA 90089-2211. Pub. by Redgrave. ISSN 0146-0013. Began 1976. q \$63. 128 pg.

Release Print, ed. Robert Anbian. 346 Ninth Street, 2nd floor, San Francisco CA 94103. 415/552-8760. Pub of Film Arts Foundation. ISSN 0890-5231.

Screen World, ed. John Willis, 225 Park Ave. S., New York NY 10003. 212/2541600. Pub by Crown Publishers. ISSN 00808288. Began 1949. annual \$19.95.

Sightlines, ed. Ray Rolff. Circ. 3,000. 920 Barnsdale Road, Suite 152, La Grange IL 60525. 708/482-4000. Pub. of American Film and Video Association. Began 1977. q \$16, inst \$20.40 pg.

SMPTE Journal, ed. Jeffrey Friedman. Circ. 12,000. 595 W, Hartsdale Ave., White Plains NY 10607. 914/761-1100. Technical pub. of Society of Motion Picture and TV Engineers. ISSN 0036-1682. Began 1916. m \$75/ foreign: \$85. 80 pg.

Spectator, The, ed. Abraham Ferrer. 263 S. Los Angeles Street., Ste. 307, Los Angeles CA 90012. Newsletter for Friends of Visual Communication, supporters of Asian American work in visual communication. q membership.

Spectator, The, ed. Walter Morton. Div. of Critical Studies, Cinema/TV, USC, Los Angeles CA 90089-2211. 213/740-3334/fax: 213/740-7682. ISSN 1051-0230. 2/yr \$10. instic \$20/foreign: \$15. instit: \$25. 88 pg.

Variety (daily), ed. Stephen West. 5700 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 120, Los Angeles CA 90036. 213/857-6600/fax: 213/857-0494. ISSN 0011-5509. Began 1933. US&Cart \$129/foreign: \$239, air: \$950. 24 pg tabloid.

Variety (weekly). ed. Peter Bart 475 Park Ave. So., New York NY 10016. 212/7791100/fax: (212) 779-0026. ISSN 0042-2738. Began 1905. \$129/Can: \$155/Europe: \$250/ rest: \$450/world-wide surface: \$195. 106 pg. tabloid.

Velvet Light Trap, Editorial Groups at U of Wisconsin and U of Texas. Circ. 3,500. Dept of Com. Arts, Vilas Hall, U of WI Madison WI 53706. Pub. by U TX Press, Journals, Box 7819. Austin, TX, 78713. ISSN 0149-1830. Began 1971. 6/yr \$15. ins: \$28/foreign: \$17.50, inst \$30.50. 94 pg.

Visions, ed. Marie-France Alderman, Boston Film/Video Foundation, 1126 Boylston St., Boston MA 02215. Began 1990. 4/yr \$10/ foreign: \$20. 60 pg.

Westerns and Serials, ed. Norman Kietzer. Circ. 2,000. Rt 1, Box 103, Vernon Center, MN 56090. 507/549-3677. For those interested in old westerns and serials. Began 1974. q \$16.

Wide Angle, ed. Jeanne Hall. Circ. 2,500. Ohio University School of Film, 378 Lindley Hall, Athens OH 45701. Pub. by Johns Hopkins U Press. ISSN 0160-6840. Began 1978. q \$20, inst \$46/foreign: \$26.75, inst: \$52.75. 65 pg.

A slightly different version of this article originally appeared in *CineAction*, ed. Guy Hennebelle, 106 Blvd. St-Denis, 9240 Cowberrie, France.